

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/741,303  
Filed: December 18, 2003  
AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION  
Page 9

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
SEP 05 2006

### REMARKS

This Amendment is a full and timely response to the Office Action dated June 5, 2006.

Claims 1-28 were pending in the application. Claims 1-28 have been rejected. Claims 1, 6, 15 and 20 have been amended. New claims 28-34 have been added. No new matter is added, and support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification and in the original claims. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-34 will be pending in this application.

In the June 5, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejected all then pending claims 1-28. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. For the reasons set forth below, the Applicants submit that the rejections should be withdrawn and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

#### I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 12, 13, 15-18, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,571 to Woods ("Woods"). In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), a reference must disclose every element of a claim. M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended to more clearly claim the invention. Claims 1 and 15 as amended state "defining target rules for detection of target hits in an article, comprising defining a target article region and a target definition comprising at least one concept."

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/741,303  
Filed: December 18, 2003  
AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION  
Page 10

Woods does not disclose defining a target definition comprising a concept for detecting target hits in an article as claimed in the present invention. Woods discloses a method and system for generating query responses in a computer-based document retrieval system. The method and system disclosed in Woods can locate small relevant passages of text from documents in a corpus and can then rank the located relevant passages. Woods further discloses that a term/concept relationship network can be used to connect terms in a query with terms in the text. *See, e.g.*, Woods, 5:7-15. However, Woods does not disclose defining a concept in the search query.

Since Woods does not include all of the elements of claims 1 and 15, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 15.

Claims 2-4, 12, and 13 depend from claim 1 and claims 16-18, 26 and 27 depend from claim 15 and are patentable over Woods for at least the same reasons as stated above for claims 1 and 15. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2-4, 12, 13, 16-18, 26 and 27.

## II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5, 6, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0049674 to Talib et al. (“Talib”). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art references must disclose or suggest all of the claim elements.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/741,303

Filed: December 18, 2003

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Page 11

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1 and thus incorporate all of the elements of claim 1. Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 15 and thus incorporate all of the elements of claim 15. As discussed above, Woods does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 15. Talib does not cure the deficiencies of Woods. Thus, for the reasons set forth in relation to claims 1 and 15 above, claims 5, 6, 19, and 20 are allowable over Woods in view of Talib, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 5, 6, 19, and 20.

Claims 7 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods in view of Talib and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0174101 to Fernley et al. ("Fernley"). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art references must disclose or suggest all of the claim elements.

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and thus incorporates all of the elements of claim 1. Claim 21 depends from claim 15 and thus incorporates all of the elements of claim 15. As discussed above, Woods does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 15. Talib and Fernley do not cure the deficiencies of Woods. Thus, for the reasons set forth in relation to claims 1 and 15 above, claims 7 and 21 are allowable over Woods in view of Talib and Fernley, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 7 and 21.

Claims 8-11, 14, 22-25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woods in view of Talib and further in view of Fernley and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,349 to Sacco ("Sacco"). To establish a *prima facie* case of

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/741,303  
Filed: December 18, 2003  
AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION  
Page 12

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art references must disclose or suggest all of the claim elements.

Claims 8-11, and 14 depend from claim 1 and thus incorporate all of the elements of claim 1. Claims 22-25 and 28 depend from claim 15 and thus incorporate all of the elements of claim 15. As discussed above, Woods does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 15. Talib, Fernley, and Sacco do not cure the deficiencies of Woods. Thus, for the reasons set forth in relation to claims 1 and 15 above, claims 8-11, 14, 22-25 and 28 are allowable over Woods in view of Talib, Fernley and Sacco, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 8-11, 14, 22-25 and 28.

### **III. New Claims 29-34**

New claims 29-34 have been added. Applicants believe that new claims 29-34 are in condition for allowance.

### **IV. Prior Art Made of Record and Not Relied Upon**

The Office Action states that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. Applicant respectfully traverses the characterizations and relevance of these reference as prior art or otherwise, and respectfully reserves the right to present such arguments and other material should the Examiner maintain rejection of Applicant's claims, based upon the references made of record and not relied upon.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/741,303  
Filed: December 18, 2003  
AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION  
Page 13

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**SEP 05 2006**

### CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action of June 5, 2006. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks and Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an amendment, please call 404 815 6061.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Turton  
Reg. No. 40,852

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530  
Phone: 404 815 6061